

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated December 19, 2008, has been received and carefully reviewed. The preceding amendments and the following remarks form a full and complete response thereto. Claim 1 is amended as to matters of form only. New claims 36-38 have been added. Support for the amendments can be found, inter alia, in the original claim, and at pages 9 and 11-13 of the original specification. No new matter is added. Claims 1-2, 4-11 and 18-35 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration

Applicants' representative thanks the Supervisory Examiner Mackey for taking the time to discuss this application and the pending rejection during the telephonic interview on June 17, 2009.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 18-35 were rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants traverse the rejections and submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 25 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the issues identified in the Office Action related to form. Namely, the claims are no longer narrative and the antecedent basis problem has been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn.

The following prior art rejections have been made:

- Claims 1-9, 15, 17, 20-22, 24, 25, 28 and 29-31 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Saltsov et al. (US 6,371,473);
- Claims 10-14, 16 and 27 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saltsov '473 in view of Salstov (US 7,051,926);
- Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saltsov '473 in view of Mennie et al (US 6,241,069);
- Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saltsov '473 in view of Ross (US 6,540,136).

Applicants traverse each of the rejections and submit that claims 1-2, 4-11 and 18-35 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor rendered obvious by any of the cited prior art references taken singly or in combination.

Claim 1, upon which all other claims depend, defines an apparatus for processing bank notes. The apparatus includes a transport system having a plurality of transport paths for transporting bank notes. The transport system includes a diverter device with a bidirectionally drivable transport path linking two branchings of a transport path to permit bank notes in the transport path to be transported in two opposite directions. The diverter device includes at least four inputs/outputs and a diverter module with at least four inputs/outputs. The diverter module is a separate component and is arranged to be moved, as a whole, from a first position within the transport system (i.e., its normal, working position) to a second position at least partially away from the transport system. The bidirectionally drivable transport path is in fixed position relative to the diverter module.

For example, diverter module 33 is a separate component. See paragraph 0037 (substitute specification). As described at paragraph 0054 (of the substitute specification), the diverter module 33 can be moved from its position within the transport system (the claimed first position) to a second position, by being removed as a single part or swung open as a single part:

To permit access to the transport channels for clearing a jam, the diverter module 33 will preferably be designed so that it can be removed from the apparatus as a single part after fastening screws are loosened, and/or opened by being swung open. Thus, one or more transport path sections, preferably those with rollers not actively driven, are removable from the rest of the module case or can especially preferably be swung open, i.e. swiveled away, from the rest of the module case via a fastening axis. (emphasis added.)

Thus, a novel configuration is claimed wherein the diverter module can be moved (e.g., removed or swung away) from its position within the transport system to a position away from the transport system (e.g., fully removed (claim 36), partially removed (claim 37), swiveled away about a radial axis such as a hinge (claim 38).

None of the cited prior art discloses a transport system having the claimed diverter device having at least four inputs / outputs, and also having the claimed diverter module being a separate component arranged to be moved, as a whole, from a first position within the transport system to a second position partially away or completely removed therefrom, as defined by claim 1.

The Examiner contends that the Saltov patents disclose the diverter device and diverter module of the claimed invention. The Examiner asserted that the diverter device of Saltov could be defined by a group of hand picked piece parts, to obtain the

claimed inputs / outputs the diverter module having the claimed input / outputs. The Examiner further contends that the diverter module is inherently adapted "to be removed," since it could be removed by any known means, and adapted "to be swung open" since it can be moved (i.e., any movement can be considered to be equivalent to "swung open"). This position, however, ignores key features of claim 1 of the present application.

That is, claim 1 requires that the diverter device include a diverter module (*i.e.*, a standardized unit or self contained assembly - - See, e.g., Webster's New College Dictionary, 1999) - - that can be moved as a whole from the module case, which is simply not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited prior art.

The Office Action points to Fig. 28 of Saltov '473 as allegedly disclosing a module diverter, as claimed in claim 1. However, Fig. 28 merely illustrates the construction of a switched member and there is no disclosure of a diverter module as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, because none of the prior art discloses or suggests the claimed diverter module, each of the prior art rejections is improper and must be withdrawn.

In view of the above, all objections and rejections have been sufficiently addressed. The Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and request that claims 1-2, 4-11 and 18-35 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 19, 2009

/Brian A. Tollefson/  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Brian A. Tollefson  
Reg. No. 46,338  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 783-6040